



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

versy, and then to decline to abide by the decision, would be such a breach of public faith as would shock the moral sense of civilized mankind. There is a punishment for such an infamy which is not to be escaped. It is one of those natural consequences of wrongdoing which are the most severe as they are the most inevitable. It is a punishment without a termination. "Nations," as was said at the meeting of the International Law Association in Rouen in 1900, "live long; they may suffer long. Men may escape remorse on earth, at least, by suicide; after earth it may be by pardon. But no divine mercy awaits the nation that has proved itself unworthy; and its perpetuity of existence keeps it forever at the bar of public opinion. History is the Judge, and it is the history of the world of which the greatest power forms so small a part. The record of conviction is not hastily made up, but once registered, it can never be effaced."*

The decisions thus far rendered by the Court at The Hague, though felt by the losing party to work serious hardships, have been obeyed to the letter. It may be confidently expected that all which may follow will be, also. To an ordinary court the sheriff and his posse form a necessary background, though commonly held in reserve and seldom used. An international court, dealing with nations, has behind it a greater power—the pledge of public faith. As, to quote the words of Junius, private credit is wealth, so public honor is security.

A Business Plea for Peace.

BY SIR THOMAS BARCLAY.

An address given at Peterborough, England, January 17.

Miss Peckover has challenged me to tell you about the commercial side of the question. I will do so gladly. There is a very intimate connection between a nation's prosperity and peace. It has been said over and over again that the sinews of war are money. Well, the sinews of money are peace, so it is a sort of vicious circle—to fight you must have peace.

We only have to go back over a number of years and look at the daily newspapers to see how things have worked out in peace and in war. There is no better indication of the state of trade and of general prosperity than the advertisement columns of a newspaper. Look at the newspapers of to-day. There are only very few that have any advertisements to speak of at all, and what are those advertisements? Mostly advertisements for employment. That is not a very satisfactory sign. Look at the advertisements of a few years ago, when we were in a state of peace all round. Why, that great monument of journalism, *The Times*, had, I should think, something like twelve pages of advertisements; it has two or three now. I cannot understand the policy of the great newspaper proprietors, who, by pin pricking a foreign nation, ruin themselves. I should think the first thing for a newspaper proprietor to do is to select his politics, and adopt those which will produce most advertisements. It shows a very self-denying spirit on the part of certain newspapers that they are willing to forego advertisements and profits in order to stir up other nations to increase

their armaments to fight us. That is what several of the newspapers in London do. I am sorry to say there are newspapers in other countries that do that—that have that self-denying spirit which is so laudable in most things. Perhaps they have not looked over their advertisement columns for the last few years as I have done. Since this was pointed out a few weeks ago, however, I have noticed a marked change in the tone of the London newspapers; I think they must have taken a look at their advertisement columns and compared the results of peace and war on the commercial proceeds of their papers, because there is just now a milder tone on the part of the London papers towards foreign countries.

I am not prepared to say that to study one's interest is a bad thing. You can calculate with people's interest, but you cannot calculate with people's sentiment. You can make up your financial forecast if you take into consideration what people will do on account of their interest, but you cannot make up your budget where you have to take into account what people will do for sentiment. Peace is a business interest. That is the doctrine I have tried to lay before the minds of business men, not with any exaggerated idea of what would be the consequences, but because business men feel very strongly the effect of war. Many of us have to pay income tax, and you know the time was when sevenpence in the pound was considered a very heavy rate, but we think nothing of a shilling nowadays. That is one result of war. We are not at war with anybody at present, but we are paying a war rate, and that is not the only thing we are paying, but we are not a party gathering here and I won't enter into that question. Miss Peckover, Mr. Collier, and the Chairman all referred to the spirit of peace which at present seems to prevail everywhere. Parliamentary candidates, it seems, have to promise that they will support a peace policy. Well, that is a very good thing. The candidates of the party who are going out are also pledged to peace. That is a very good thing.

The King has pledged himself to peace. That is a splendid thing. Lord Lansdowne is pledged to peace—that is a good thing, and I have heard a certain gentleman speaking in favor of peace who was supposed to be the cause of the Boer War ["Oh! oh!"]. I have heard him get up at a famous dinner in the House of Commons and deliver his message of peace to the world. What is the meaning of all this keenness to figure as advocates of peace? It is because we feel the effect of war; we have gone through it and we know what it is, and an object lesson is far better than all the theory you can conjure up. How has this come about? How is it that leading people are taking trouble in explaining that they are in favor of peace? It is not because Ministers of State went down to the country and showed magic lantern slides [laughter]; nor because diplomatists delivered magnificent orations in favor of friendly relations with foreign countries,—I have heard a speech in quite a contrary sense from a diplomatist. It is not because the newspapers have been stirring us up to peace, as they have sometimes stirred us up to war. It is simply because the business men of the country don't approve of war any more.

You remember that we were all going to boycott the French Exhibition of 1900 because the French had passed some not very flattering comments upon the war

* Report of the International Law Association for 1900, p. 59.

we were waging, and there were certain French caricatures of our late good Queen which were very disgusting. I never knew any Frenchman who had seen them, for the reason that as soon as they came out they were dashed off in bundles to London for sale to English purchasers, who bought them up by telegraph before they ever reached the French public. I mention this because it shows you how absurd these international animosities are. We were going to boycott the French Exhibition because of them. The London press was furious, and you know how furious the London press can be when it likes [laughter]. They were quite willing to go to war with France about them, to spend at least another two hundred and fifty millions on a war, and raise the income tax to two shillings six pence in the pound right away on account of those caricatures which Frenchmen had never seen. That state of feeling resulted in hardly an Englishman or English woman going to the exhibition.

There is an Association of Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom. I was chairman of the British Chamber of Commerce in Paris, and as such took upon myself the responsibility of inviting the whole of the Chambers of Commerce of this country to come over to Paris to see for themselves what Paris felt. I was very much dissuaded from doing so; I was told that it was not a very propitious moment, but I replied that it was a very propitious moment to come over and show the French that we business men had no hostile feelings towards the French, and instead of getting a negative result, I got a unanimous vote. I found that the merchants and manufacturers of England took exactly my view, that it was a most absurd thing to boycott the Exhibition for sins which the French had not really committed, but only a very few Frenchmen—if, indeed, they were Frenchmen at all; I believe the great delinquent was a Greek.

They came over eight hundred strong, from seventy-six of the leading industrial centres of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and they met with a reception such as only the French can give. They defied government and diplomacy, and all that rag-tattle of officialdom, and held out their hands to the French, and said: "Look here, we're business men; you're business men. We are not going to have this bickering any further. We pay the piper, and we're not going to pay the piper if it's going on. We are ready to shake hands with you. Will you shake hands with us?" "Yes," was their reply, and a hearty shake it was, and there was an end of the matter, and the governments had simply to tuck their little heads in. [Applause.] That was the beginning of the Anglo-French rapprochement. When the King paid his memorable visit to Paris, every French and British Chamber of Commerce had passed resolutions in favor of it; two millions of English workmen had passed resolutions in favor of it; every trade union of any importance in the United Kingdom had passed resolutions in favor of it; a number of the French municipalities—very hard things to move are municipalities—had passed resolutions in favor of it; a million coöperators, the independent clergy of both countries, had passed resolutions in favor of it; and the greatest politicians on both sides had written letters highly approving of it. [Applause.] It was entirely non-political,—just as much on the one side of the channel as on the other,—and so it was quite natural

when the King came that he should get a splendid reception, and he got it [applause]; and he did a very wise thing, because he followed the wishes of his people, which it is the duty of a king to do. With that tact which characterizes him, he saw that the moment had come when he could do a good stroke of national business, and he did it. Then came the treaty of arbitration and treaty of peace without war. The rest was for diplomacy; we had done the work, and diplomacy had to ratify it. We were able to show by those treaties that the difficulties between two great countries could be adjusted without bloodshed. [Applause.] That is what the business men of England and France have done for the cause of peace between these two countries.

When I was a boy, the only way we ever thought of settling a difficulty was by standing up in a certain place and having it out. We never dreamt of any such thing as arbitration, and nations were just the same. They never dreamt of having a court of arbitration; in fact, it's such a new-fangled idea that the old fogies don't like it, and the old public school spirit still prevails a good deal among our grown-up boys; we have to be a little older before we get rid of the idea that a stand-up fight is the best thing after all. We used to say it cooled the blood; well, it spills sometimes a very great deal of blood. But the ball has been rolling on, and as soon as France was managed came the United States. For the first time, I suppose, last year we had resolutions of Chambers of Commerce in favor of peace with the United States, and now all the leading Chambers of Commerce, boards of trade and industry, associations of ship owners, and of almost every business, have come in and said, "We're going to have that treaty," and with the magnificent "go" of the Americans, they will have it. There is only one dissentient element. There are a number of senators who owe their elections to a large Irish vote, and they are opposed to the treaty, although why on earth Irishmen anywhere, and, least of all, in the United States, should be against arbitration I don't know. I should like to make an appeal to them; we owe so much to them, America owes nearly everything to Irishmen—the magnificent "go" of the United States is due largely to the presence in the American blood of the admixture of Irish blood. They think that it will favor some scheme in Ireland that they should be hostile to the passing of a treaty of arbitration with England. I cannot understand it; there is no argument and no reason which could be given for it, and yet there it is. However, it is possible that this time they will not persist in their opposition to the treaty which, in 1897, was wrecked by the opposition of those senators who had a large Irish majority in their constituencies. Mr. Roosevelt has just announced that he will withdraw all the treaties of arbitration at present submitted if they are opposed, as was the treaty of 1897. It will be a strange thing, indeed, if the United States, the most advanced country, we may say, on earth, should be the last to enter the present movement in favor of peace,—that is, to enter it officially. If the Senate hold out this time, as in 1897, I think the whole feeling of the world will be that it is a retrogressive and malicious body. ["Hear, hear."]

A few days ago we heard—the press are still recalling the arguments in Germany about it—that we were on the brink of war with Germany. It has taken every-

body by surprise, and everybody is wondering why we were on the brink of war with that country. We are told that we were about to address an ultimatum to Germany not to proceed with the increase of her navy. I don't believe for one moment that there is a single particle of truth in any such assertion, but, at the same time, it calls one's attention to the fact that such things are possible. Now just think what a war with Germany would mean. We should have avoided the danger of a war with France only to run into danger of a war with Germany. Do you know what was the result of the American Civil War? The American Civil War came at a time when the Americans had the major part of the carrying trade of the world in their hands—a fact which many people have forgotten, but it is nevertheless true. If we went to war with Germany, America would get back the carrying trade it lost on account of its Civil War. I need not go into details, but a war with Germany would be one of the most disastrous wars which we could possibly carry on, and the mere idea of it sends a shudder through everybody who knows anything about Germany. To avoid the possibility of such a war, to anticipate the possibility of such a war, a movement has been begun by well-wishers of peace with Germany for the purpose of bringing the two countries into a better state of feeling towards each other. [Applause.]

I am not sanguine that we shall ever have the same feelings towards the Germans that we have towards the French. The French are unique among nations. They are the cheeriest and most human of men, and the most beloved of nations; it does not matter what country you go to, you will always find the French are the favorites. They have generous ideals; they are not always practical men. Sometimes they go in rather recklessly for new ideas, fight for them, actually make wars for them; but you cannot help loving them. The Germans are very much like ourselves—hard-headed business men, who look to interest above everything, and we cannot afford to have them as enemies. The trade of a country depends upon its friends, and if we have enemies anywhere our trade is bound to suffer. We must look to that element in our calculations; we cannot afford to do otherwise. We have, besides, a great deal to learn from the Germans. I should like some of our people to see what the Germans are doing for technical education; I should like them to see what the Germans are doing for elementary education—none of your detailed syllabuses and examinations and other tomfoolery, but training the mind to think, and training the hands to do—that's what the Germans are trying to do. [Applause.] I should like our people to see them. There are many other things the Germans have tried—it's a great experimental nation; Old Age Pensions have been tried in Germany,—I should like to see with what success or in-success, but in any case it is worth studying. Public-houses in Germany are built on the same principles as factories, and it's just as well that we should know what they are doing in that, too. Compulsory insurance has been tried in Germany—just as well that we should know what they are doing in that. Another thing we can learn from the Germans is the perfection of their productive machinery. They beat us in many markets, because they spend more on their productive machinery, and are ready to break it up when they find it behind the age.

That leads me to mention what is supposed to be a cause of contention between Germans and Englishmen. It is their competition. I stand up for my countrymen, and say we have no feelings of that sort; we don't fight with our fists those who have beaten us in a football match, and we don't try to knock down those who have beaten us in competition in trade—we simply try to do better. On the 15th of next month I am to address an audience representing all trades and interests in Germany at Berlin. I have been invited there by the Handelsstag, the great parliament of commerce and industry in Germany. I believe I am to be asked to address a number of other trades and industrial organizations of Germany. The idea is that the German traders and manufacturers have to come into this peace combine—this trust in favor of peace, because, after all, it comes to that. We are going to move forward arm in arm in this part of Europe, and put our feet down upon war. [Loud applause.] But what, after all, is it all leading to? I am sometimes asked, "Why don't you first stop the war in the Far East?" [Laughter.] There are people who expect a good deal of me. [Laughter.]

We are not going to get rid of war at once, and I don't know that this war in the Far East is not another object lesson that is very favorable to the movement everywhere. It shows us to what extravagance war can lead. Do you know what the war is costing the Japanese every day? It is costing them £4,000,000 a month, one million sterling a week, and the Russians twice as much, if not more. The result will be that these two nations will be laden with an enormous burden of debt when the war comes to an end, and the money they both have to find to carry it on costs them ten per cent. See what that means. There was no accumulation in either country. When we go to war, at any rate, we have people who can pay something towards the cost—there is an accumulation; but the Japanese are not old enough to have an accumulation, and the Russians have never had any, so that I don't know what is going to be the outcome of this extraordinary expenditure. Mediation has been offered to both by our government and the French government, and I believe others. You know that under the Convention of The Hague, which the Russians and the Japanese have pledged themselves to accept, if mediation is offered, they cannot consider it as an unfriendly act. The Japanese are ready to accept it at this moment; but the Russians, it seems, have refused, although they proposed the very clause under which mediation was offered.

Now I don't want to lay the charge of brutality against any governments, but I very strongly suspect that they have all offered mediation in a very half-hearted way—they have offered it with an *arrière pensée*; there is an idea that this war may perhaps be rather beneficial to Western Europe, because it will put both Japan and Russia out of the running. To Germany I believe this war is not displeasing, because Russia was a danger to Germany; and it has been a revelation to France that she has been leaning on a very thin reed indeed in leaning upon Russia. The *entente* between France and England has in this as in other ways changed the whole configuration of things throughout the world. The Russians have become isolated from the rest of Europe, France becomes the friend of

England, and Germany now seeks to join France and England. It is a complete shake-up of the relations of nations with each other. But cannot we do something, all the same, to stop this war? I was recently at a meeting in Paris where a resolution was passed which was to be submitted for signature all over the world. It issued from Berne, and will be submitted here as elsewhere — a vast petition to the two governments to accept mediation and bring the war to an end. I personally have a great deal of distrust of petitions. I have never yet seen a petition that did any good. Instead of petitions, I think all the municipalities of Western Europe, all the organized societies, all the Chambers of Commerce, all the Trades Unions, ought to pass resolutions against this war, and not send them to the Japanese and the Russian governments, but to their own governments, to force them publicly before the whole world to offer mediation; and then I should like to see whether the Russians would refuse it. [Loud applause.]

There is a public opinion in the world which every government respects. Look at Tolstoy, who stood up against his own government and said, "You are doing an evil thing!" Have they turned Tolstoy out of the country? No. Have they persecuted him? No. Why? Because the public opinion of Europe would not have stood it. [Loud applause.] If we could get our government and the French government to openly, before the whole world, say, "The people of this country consider this war a horrible thing, an inhuman thing, a useless thing: bring it to an end or accept mediation!" I am sure affairs would assume a different complexion. I received a letter a few days ago from one of the most eminent men in Japan, saying she would accept mediation, and I am perfectly sure he spoke for his country. [Applause.] It is the Russians who will not accept mediation, and, unfortunately, the fall of Port Arthur is an untoward circumstance which has added to the difficulty of getting Russia to accept. Still we need never despair; let us go on and on, and even if we do not get mediation, at any rate we shall show that the people of this country and France are determined to continue the work they have begun as between themselves, and to try to secure the peace of the civilized world for some time to come. [Loud and prolonged applause.]

Peace the First Condition of Progress.

The *Eastern Morning News* of Hull, England, gives the following account of an address made by William Randal Cremer, M. P., at a meeting held on the 13th of February, under the auspices of the East Hull Liberal Association:

Mr. Cremer, who was very enthusiastically received, said at the outset that his answer to his friends who asked why he spent so much time in the cause of peace, was that peace was the first condition of all progress. If working men who were progressive would remember that all the great reforms which had been reaped from time to time had been conferred upon the country during times of peace, they would see how absolutely necessary it was that they should fulfill the first condition of progress and keep the peace.

When the organization of which he had been the secretary for thirty-four years formulated a plan for the establishment of a High Court of Nations, they were laughed to scorn by the skeptics and scoffers; but they took very little notice of them, and kept on the course they believed to be right, and to-day could proudly point to the fact that the great tribunal which was said to be impossible was in existence, the great Peace Tribunal at The Hague. [Loud applause.]

One of the advantages of the Convention under which that tribunal was set up was not long since made apparent when the Dogger Bank incident happened. But for that Convention bad blood would have been excited on both sides, and the press, which was really the modern war maker, would have lashed the public mind into a state of frenzy, demanding that the dispute should be wiped out in blood — not their own, but somebody else's. [Applause.] Fortunately the Hague Convention was remembered, and the dispute would be settled as it could never have been settled had it ended in war.

Within the last century there had been nearly two hundred instances of disputes and differences between nations that had been settled by arbitration or friendly mediation. Many of them were very trifling in their nature, but great wars had frequently resulted from mere trifling disputes. The Alabama dispute in the Civil War of America was referred to a court at Geneva, and this gave a great impetus to the cause of arbitration all over the world. [Applause.]

Mr. Cremer then dealt with the work done by the League during the last seventeen years in their endeavors to promote arbitration treaties with the civilized powers. He told how the first effort with the United States failed, and how the first treaty was made with France. He interjected the opinion that he was not quite certain that the treaty concluded between Great Britain and Japan was not very unfortunate in its nature and character, because he thought it induced the Japanese to precipitate that terrible struggle which was to-day going on between Japan and Russia. The nation was never appealed to on the matter, and in case any other power should join Russia, we were obliged, under the treaty, to go to the assistance of Japan.

Continuing, Mr. Cremer said that after the failure to obtain the arbitration treaty with America, they turned their attention to the Old World nations, and, despite the skeptics and scoffers, could to-day proudly point to the fact that there were in existence thirteen treaties of arbitration among the nations of the Old World, and there were seven other such treaties which had been drafted, and were now being considered by the Senate of the United States of America. If those were ratified it would mean that within the last fifteen months twenty treaties of arbitration will have been concluded.

The speaker also dealt with another phase of the matter, and after paying a tribute to the action of the king, who had the happy faculty of being able to do the right thing at the right time and in the right way, for his action in the cause of peace, said that it was not a rearrangement of tariffs that was wanted, but the stopping of the huge crimes we had committed in the past. [Applause.] He also referred to the Interparliamentary Union, and showed how from the first gathering in Paris, with thirty-eight English and French statesmen,